

INTERNATIONAL BULLETIN

VOL. 3

JAN-FEB, 1949

NO. 8



15¢

International Bulletin
Vol. 3 No. 8
Publication
of
American Fraction
Left Communist International
For Information

Write

David Atkins

850 East 175th St.

N.Y.C., 60, N.Y.

Contents

Page

- 1....."Trotskyism and the Labor Party".....D.A.
4....."Civil Wars and Imperialist Conflicts in Burma, Malaya, and
Indonesia".....Translated by D. Atkins from Publication
of French Fraction "L'Internationaliste, Oct. 1948
7....."State Capitalism and the Classes...by Bukharin and
Preobrazhensky from the ABC of Communism
10....."Nature, Function, and Policy of the Revolutionary Party
of the Working Class "Part I.....Translated by L. Massari
from "Prometeo," monthly magazine of the Internationalist
Communist Party of Italy

European Publications

Battaglia Comunista - Italy

L'Internationaliste - France

L'Internationaliste - Belgium

Trotskyism and the Labor Party

Leon Trotsky wrote in 1938, "The Fourth International is now the only international organization which not only takes clearly into account the driving forces of the imperialist epoch but is armed with a system of transitional demands which are capable of uniting the masses for a revolutionary struggle for power". (From the Foreword to "The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International").

Under the heading "Objective prerequisites for a Socialist Revolution" (from the Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth Int'l.), the founding Conference of the Fourth International discovered, "The economic prerequisite for the proletarian revolution has already in general achieved the highest point of fruition that can be achieved under capitalism. Mankind's productive forces stagnate". "Democratic regimes, as well as fascist, stagger on from one bankruptcy to another" (IB ID)

Further, under the heading, "The Proletariat and its Leaderships", they continue, "The chief obstacle in the path of transforming the pre-revolutionary into a revolutionary state is the opportunist character of proletarian leadership: its petty-bourgeois cowardice before the big bourgeoisie and its perfidious connection with it even in its death agony."

"The multi-millioned masses again and again enter the road of revolution. But each time they are blocked by their own conservative bureaucratic machines"

(IB ID)

Under the heading, "The Minimum Program and the Transitional Program", Trotskyism finds a bridge. "It is necessary to help the masses in the process of the daily struggle to find the bridge between present demands and the socialist program of the revolution. This bridge should include a system of transitional demands, stemming from today's conditions and from today's consciousness of wide layers of the working class and unalterably leading to one final conclusion: the conquest of power by the proletariat." No less.

In the United States, the program of Trotskyism revolves around the propaganda for the organization of a labor party. It does not matter to Trotskyism that Labor Parties in the U.S., England, Germany (Weimar Republic, and before War I, under the Kaiser) France, Italy etc. etc., which were and are the Parties of the 2nd International, prevent and have always prevented the "unity of the masses for the revolutionary struggle for power;" and seek to revive the "stagnating forces of production of capitalism", and prop up staggering "democratic" regimes by fascist economic measures (state capitalist nationalization). Labor Parties on a world scale are the obstacle, which is "the chief obstacle in the path of transforming the pre-revolutionary into a revolutionary state" (Stalinism included). The leaderships of Labor Parties, and their budding counterparts in the U.S. are the very ones who are characterized for their petty-bourgeois cowardice before the big bourgeoisie and their perfidious connection with it even in its death agony." The labor parties and their trade union leadership, with their conservative bureaucratic machines block the masses from taking the road to revolution again and again". The labor party therefore is not the bridge between "present demands and the socialist program of the revolution", as the Trotskyites so glibly state, but, rather the bridge between the workers antagonism to the capitalist state, on the one hand, and the need of the capitalist state to retain the support of the workers for its system of exploitation, for its wars, for its colonial oppression, through the labor party.

Trotskyism (Cannon & Shachtman) is well aware that the British Labor Party, for example, performs the duty of rescuing British Imperialism from its death agony, by centralizing production through nationalization, maneuvering by changing the juridical relation of the colonies and dominions to the mother oppressor

(England), and demagogically propagandizing this as the millennium of freedom for the colonial oppressed. Trotskyism (Cannon & Shactman) is well aware that the British Labor Party is busy preparing English Imperialism with its American partner, the U.S. Imperialism and their competitor, Russian Imperialism for Imperialist War III. Trotskyism is aware of the fact that the sum-total of the purposes of a Labor Party are, "preserve capitalism".

Trotskyism (Cannon & Shactman) know the petty treacherous character of labor parties in the U.S. The American Labor Party, for example, which began its existence by supporting the representative of big capital, Roosevelt, and to date supported a representative of smaller capital, Wallace, continually, makes deals between the Republican and Democratic ward heelers and their masters, and above all was a patriotic defender of American Imperialism in War II. Now, under purely Stalinist tutelage it clings still to that part of the C.I.O. bureaucracy friendly to Russian Imperialism.

The same is essentially true of the Liberal Party, which is also a "Labor" party, but antagonistic to Russia, and friendly to Social Democracy, based on the Dubinsky-Hollander combination.

The Trotskyites also know that at a certain stage, Labor Partyism inevitably fuses directly with the bourgeoisie. A small illustration of that was the liquidation of the Wisconsin Farmer-Labor Federation into the Republican Party in 1948.

The Trotskyites are well aware of the facts therefore, that Labor Parties support, defend, and prop up, the capitalist economy; capitalist democracy; exploitation of the wage-workers; and Imperialist Wars.

Knowing all this, why do the Trotskyites (Cannon and Shactman) advocate a Labor Party? The Trotskyites answer, "We are not sectarians; we cannot remain isolated; we must follow the mass movement." Since, however, with the victory of Truman in the presidential elections, the Labor Party idea has been dumped by the more "radical" C.I.O., and A.F.L. leaders for a more practical policy of integration in the Democratic Party, the masses are moving in that direction. We suggest that the Trotskyites abandon their Labor Party sectarianism and join the Democratic Party.

The more "scientific" and erudite among the Trotskyites answer; "There is a contradiction between the objective prerequisites for revolution and the subjective immaturity of the American Workers." Therefore, what do the Trotskyites propose, a revolutionary vanguard party that shall at all costs, organize and agitate the working class for the revolutionary aims of socialism? Oh, No! The Trotskyites propose a Labor Party to harmonize with the subjective immaturity of the American worker. According to them this Labor Party, on a national, not a local scale, mind you, will be the vehicle through which the workers will go beyond capitalism and establish Socialism, (workers and farmers government")

In other words, they spread the lie that counter-revolution can be reformed into revolution (a la Labor Party). Trotskyism flies in the face of history and of present political reality.

We must characterize Trotskyism, (both of the Cannon and Shactman varieties) as an obstacle on the Road to the Proletarian Revolution, because it advocates a political instrument whose only aim is to save a dying system, capitalism; because it does not paint the instrumentality of the Labor Party in its true light; because it, (Trotskyism) is well informed on the treacherous role of labor parties; yet, because of a fatal political weakness, (lack of understanding of the role of a revolutionary party and consequent fear of the tasks involved) fears isolation and passes to the opposite extreme, the policy of liquidation into the camp of the Capitalist Labor Front.

The program by contrast, of International Left Communism is the only base upon which a revolutionary party and International can be constructed.

What We Stand For

- 1-Our conception of the world and the society proper to it is that of Marx's scientific Socialism.
- 2-For the reconstitution of a Revolutionary International against the International of Betrayal (Social Democracy, Stalinism, Trotskyism)
- 3-Against collaboration with the bourgeois and pseudo-proletarian parties which uphold the false and deceitful banner of "true democracy". Therefore we oppose the "united front" which is a front opposed to the working class.
- 4-We denounce as counter-revolutionary, every movement which, with an eye to easier agitation and electoral success views parliamentary decisions as useful. During electoral campaigns we continue the agitation for the general historic aims of the working class. We do not take the least responsibility for the pseudo-proletarian parties (Stalinist, Socialist, Trotskyite or Laborite).
- 5-The trade unions of the C.I.O. and A.F.L., Railroad Brotherhoods and "Independent Unions", are part of the legal apparatus of the Capitalist State. Working class unity will be achieved on the basis of the platform of the party of the revolution, and, under its leadership, within those organisms, created in the revival of the proletarian class struggle.
- 6-The farm-workers are the class-brothers of the industrial workers and must be won to a position of class-solidarity.
- 7- All so-called movements of colonial independence have an Imperialist base. There does not exist for the colonial and semi-colonial areas, any longer, the problem of a bourgeois revolution. The only road is proletarian revolution.
- 8- The proletariat must work for the defeat of its own bourgeoisie and its satellites in the advanced industrial sectors of world capitalism, as well as for the defeat of its own bourgeoisie and satellites in the colonial and semi-colonial areas of world capitalism, in time of war.
- 9- The defeat of the bourgeoisie, on a world scale, accomplished through the civil war of the proletariat, under the guidance and leadership of the Revolutionary International Party, will be the beginning of the Socialist Reorganization of Society under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.
- 10- The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, will serve as the transition to the classless society of Socialism, where the State will cease to exist, and Government and Tyranny, the history of the past.
- 11- The Dictatorship of the Proletariat is not to be understood as a defense of the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat will arise in Russia, which is now an Imperialist State, through Socialist Revolution.

D.A.

Civil Wars and Imperialist Rivalries in Burma, Malaya and Indonesia

The civil wars which actually unroll in Burma and Malaya have the same limits as the Viet-Nam, the struggle of the Republic of Indonesia against the Dutch Crown, the bloody movement of the Philippine Hukbullahaps against the pro-American government of the ex-collaborator Roxas.

In shaking the power of the traditional imperialisms, the Japanese invasion at the same time brought to life the inextricable social contradictions of these backward regions of the world. The political life, formerly, was limited more or less, to the friction of different ethnic groups, under the complacent eye of the colonial powers, has assumed considerable scope. New nationalisms are born, concealing complex social forces, oscillating between Imperialist influence, on the one hand, and violent rivals, on the other, serving willingly, or unwillingly one or the other. In all cases, powerless to resolve the problems posed at the start.

The nationalism of the Javanese intelligentsia dreams of unity of the Islands and a *Kulturbekamp* which would include territory as far as the Celebes, under occupation by Holland.

The nationalism of the Chinese and Malaysians, in the unions and in the Chambers of Commerce - rejecting the Statutes as "too favorable to British Imperialism", claiming the status of a Dominion united with Singapore.

The nationalism of the motley anti-fascist league of Burma, devoid of a solid social base, since it is not indigenous to Burma. Neither is its capitalist class. Likewise, neither is its middle strata native to Burma. A nationalism infinitely disunited in the face of the problems raised by the task of power.

As ferocious and reactionary as the imperialism it combats, this nationalism has destroyed the India-rubber plantations; the oil wells of Java; enclosed in the starved villages of the Philippines 4,000,000 terrorized farmers, overshadowing the pillage and extortion in Burma and Malaya.

Quixotic and servile at present, it plans industrialization and a war of spears made of bamboo under the surveillance of Holland, to save the delegates of the U.N.C.O. It takes Mandalay for the center of the world, and believes the Burmese destiny is to discover "a third form of socialism, intermediate between English Socialism and Russian Socialism." While trembling at the indisposition of the very anglo-american financiers that they have need of.

One finds the radical wing of nationalism in Burma and in Malaya, to be the Moscow Communists, as in Europe, the Indies and the Philippines. Their organizations throw themselves into the movement of the exploited of the sugar-refineries, the Philippine oil-workers; Chinese and Hindu oil-well workers, the miners of the lead and silver mines; the Chinese tin workers, and Malayan rubber plantation workers. In these countries, where the cost of living is 6 to 7 times higher than before the war, they have not combined wage-demands with anti-imperialist propaganda.

They have highlighted the division of land to the peasants of Central Burma and independence to the mountain tribes of the border country. They have not shrunk from any political compromise; from any social demagoguery; from any historic falsehood, in order to carry out against the English bandits, the fight of Russian Imperialism.

Burma was due to be granted its independence in face of the agitation during the Japanese surrender. Now, it renounces its aspirations in order to remain in the Commonwealth. At the beginning of this year it constituted itself as a federated autonomous republic, with its capital at Rangoon, Thaking Nu, its premier, considered a moderate socialist. He proclaimed in June 1948, "the Burmese wish to follow the soviet ideology."

Not that this reformer, attached to the liberal administration of Burma, traditionally corrupt, was a communist. On the contrary, two Burmese communist parties were thrown successively into illegality in June 1946, then, in October 1946 under the anti-fascist league to which it belonged. But nationalism in a backward country, as we have seen in Central Europe, is compelled to resort to the most modern forms of State Capitalism. Sustained by so-called Marxist principle, the Burmese premier stated their aim "to liberate ourselves from the yoke of capital and private property." They wish to extend the nationalization without compensation to the foreigners and to force from London the fiscal control of the country in order to give it to the so-called native official capital.

Only, the great appetites of these "progressive" Burmese strikes against themselves. As a matter of fact, the new state, as independent as it may seem..... will remain in the financial apparatus of Anglo-American Imperialists for its reconstruction. Actually, it is not able to rely on an indigenous capitalism, the root cause of the breaking apart, like Tito in Europe.

This is the breaking - apart which manifests itself - in a manner almost burlesque - in the war of the government of Rangoon against the insurgent Communists who today control almost a third of the country. Both still-born, on the identical basis of an aggravated nationalism. At any rate, the Communists have the propaganda advantage of an "extremist" position, which more and more attracts the sympathy of a population violently anti-English. Whereas the army and police is upset by the desertions to the enemy, while the rebels influence the miners unions and the peasants, the civil apparatus of the State is compelled to drain its personnel in order to organize itself into a military command. The ministries resigned one after another in order to go off to the armies; thus threatening a "political" crisis of a truly new character.

Therefore, with one blow, the government which yesterday confiscated an English Navigation company, throwing London's City into jitters, hesitates characteristically, while it believes it can build an independent and "progressive" Burma. It finds itself involved up to its neck in a conflict in which the real interests at stake are clearly established: The 80,000,000 pounds the English have invested in the forests; electricity and transport; the petroleum of Burma Oil, the commerce of the Steel Brothers.

In Malaya, the situation is much more simple, but also less rich in savoury lessons. The country, in effect, remains as a colony. The Statute of the Federation, promulgated in 1947, maintains intact the English authority incarnated in the High-Commissioner. Profiting from the troubles of the Sultans, more or less compromised during the Japanese occupation, England started to limit their prerogatives. This does not stop them from receiving the support represented by the political indolence of the Malaysians who constitute the peasant class and the parasitic aristocracy. It is in the Chinese circles, centered in the villages, and representing for another reason, the majority of the total population, and possessing an important part of the capital of the country, that there developed an opposition to the Statutes. From which the Communist movement, actually in

open rebellion, pushed to the extreme the nationalist demands.

But the State apparatus is here the traditional and solid colonial apparatus. The High-Commissioner is mobilizing reinforcements from Hong-Kong; recalling troops from England, sending the Dayaks, head hunters of Borneo into action against "the plan of Communist insurrection through which they wish to install the Soviet republic of Malaya."

England has an armed mistress to defend its economy. The Malaysians, with their exports of Tin and India-rubber to America (which in 1947 amounted to \$284,000,000) enjoys a preponderant role in Anglo-American relations - that is to say, in the tendency of British Imperialism to resist Yankee Imperialism.

The spectacle of the sordid struggles of Imperialism is rendered still more sordid by the fact of the presence of a proletariat, relatively developed, it is true in these countries. The part that it takes in events, blended in the mass of other classes, maneuvered by the forces of Russian Imperialism (moreover, by a national-independence, of which the emptiness, economic and historic, is shown in the Burmese example) is a new proof of the appalling defeat suffered by revolutionary communism in the world. Revolutionary Communism will be reborn only when the groups who strive to regain a class position, understand equally that it is time to break with the false line of "liberty of the peoples to dispose of themselves" (self-determination of the peoples). They must cease tying the destiny of the proletariat of the backward countries to their native exploiters, that is, to the Imperialist powers. It is time to take a position, truly internationalist and socialist.

Translated by D. Atkins
from publication of French Fraction
L'Internationaliste - Oct. 1948

State Capitalism and the Classes

The conduct of the imperialist war was differentiated from that of all previous wars, not only by the dimensions of the conflict and by its devastating effects, but in addition by the fact that in every country actively engaged in the imperialist war the whole of economic life had to be subordinated to war purposes. In former conflicts the bourgeoisie could carry them on merely by providing funds. The world war, however, attained such huge proportions and affected such highly developed countries that money alone did not suffice. It became essential in this war that the steel industry devote itself entirely to the making of heavy guns, whose calibre was continually being enlarged; that coal should be mined for war purposes alone; that metals, textiles, hides, everything should be employed in war service. Naturally, therefore, the greatest hope of victory was for whichever of the State Capitalist Trusts could best harness production and transport to the chariot of war.

How was this to be achieved? Manifestly, the only way in which it could be achieved was by the complete centralization of production. It would be necessary to arrange things in such a way that production would go on smoothly; that it would be well organized; that it would be entirely under the control of the fighters; that is to say of the General Staff; that all the orders of those wearing epaulettes and stars would be carried out.

How could the bourgeoisie do this? The matter was quite simple. To that end it was necessary that the bourgeoisie should place private production, privately owned trusts and syndicates, at the disposal of the capitalist robber State. This is what they did for the duration of the war. Industry was "mobilized" and "militarized", that is to say it was put under the orders of the State of the military authorities. "But how?", some of our readers will ask. In that way the bourgeoisie would surely forfeit its income? That would be nationalization! When everything has been handed over to the State, where will the bourgeoisie come in, and how will the capitalists reconcile themselves to such a condition of affairs? It is an actual fact that the bourgeoisie agreed to the arrangement. But there is nothing very remarkable in that, for the privately owned syndicates and trusts were not handed over to the workers' state, but to the Imperialist State, the State which belonged to the bourgeoisie. Was there anything to alarm the bourgeoisie in such a prospect? The capitalists simply transferred their possessions from one pocket to another; the possessions remained as large as ever.

We must never forget the class character of the State. The State must not be conceived as constituting a "third power" standing above the classes; from head to foot it is a class organization. Under the dictatorship of the workers it is a working-class organization. Under the dominion of the bourgeoisie it is just as definitely an economic organization as is a trust or a syndicate.

We see, then, that when the bourgeoisie handed over the privately owned syndicates and trusts to the State, it handed them over to its own State to the robber capitalist state and not to the proletarian state; consequently it had nothing to lose by the change. Is it not precisely the same thing to a manufacturer, when we may call Schulz or Smith, whether he receives his profits from the counting house of a syndicate, or from the State bank? Far from losing by the change, the bourgeoisie actually gained. There was a gain because, through the State centralization of industry, the war machine was enabled to work to better effect, and there was a greater chance of winning the war of rapine.

It is not surprising therefore that in nearly all capitalist countries, there

took place during the war a development of State capitalism in the place of the capitalism of private syndicates or trusts. Germany, for example, gained many successes and was able for a lengthy period to resist attack from enemies of a greatly superior strength, simply because the German bourgeoisie was so successful in the organization of its State capitalism.

The change to State capitalism was effected in various ways. In most cases, a State-monopoly of production and trade was instituted. This implied that production and trade were placed wholly in the hands of the bourgeois State. Sometimes the transformation was not effected all at once, but by installments. This took place when the state merely bought some shares of the syndicate or trust.

An enterprise in which this had taken place was half private and half a State affair, but the bourgeois state held the leading strings. Furthermore, even when certain enterprises remained in private hand, they were often subjected to governmental control. Some enterprises were by special legislation forced to buy their raw materials from certain others, while the latter had to sell to the former in specified quantities, and at fixed prices. The State prescribed working methods, specified what materials were to be used, and rationed these materials. Thus, in place of private capitalism, State Capitalism came into being.

Under State Capitalism, instead of the separate organization of the bourgeoisie there now flourishes a united organization, the state organization. Down to the time of the war there existed in any capitalist country the State organization of the Bourgeoisie, and there also existed separately from the State large numbers of bourgeois organizations, such as syndicates, trusts, societies of entrepreneurs, landowners' organizations, political parties, journalists' unions, learned societies, artists clubs, the church, societies for the clergy, Boy Scouts, and Cadet Corps (white guard organizations of youth), private detective bureaus etc. Under State Capitalism all these separate organizations fuse with the bourgeois state; they become as it were, State departments, and they work in accordance with a general plan subject to the "high command"; in the mines and factories they do whatever is ordered by the General Staff; they preach in the churches whatever will be useful for the robbers of the general staff; they write in the newspapers under the orders of the general staff; their pictures, their books, and their poems are produced under the orders of the general staff; they invent machinery, weapons, poison gas etc; to meet the needs of the general staff. In this manner the whole of life is militarized in order to secure for the bourgeoisie the continued receipt of its filthy lucre.

State capitalism signifies an enormous accession of strength to the great bourgeoisie. Just as under the working-class dictatorship, in the Workers State, the working class is more powerful in proportion as the Soviet authority, the trade unions, the Communist Party etc., work more harmoniously together, so under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the capitalist class is strong in proportion to the success with which all the bourgeois organizations work together. State capitalism, centralizing all these organizations, converting them all into the instruments of a single, united organization, contributes immensely to the power of capital. Bourgeois dictatorship attains its climax in State capitalism.

State capitalism flourished during the war in all the large capitalist countries. In Tsarist Russia too, it began to make its way (in the form of war industry committees, monopolies etc.) Subsequently, however, the Russian bourgeoisie, alarmed by the revolution of March 1917, became afraid lest productive industry should pass into the hands of the proletariat together with the State authority.

For this reason, after the March revolution, the bourgeoisie did not merely refrain from attempts to organize production, but positively sabotaged industry.

We see that State Capitalism, far from putting an end to exploitation, actually increases the power of the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, the Scheidemannes in Germany, and social solidarians in other lands, have contended that this forced labor is socialism. As soon, they say, as everything is in the hands of the State, socialism will be realized. They fail to see that in such a system the State is not a proletarian State, since it is in the hands of those who are the malicious and deadly enemies of the proletariat.

State Capitalism, uniting and organizing the bourgeoisie, increasing the power of capitalism, has, of course, greatly weakened the working class. Under State capitalism, the workers became the white slaves of the capitalist State. They were deprived of the right to strike; they were mobilized and militarized; everyone who raised his voice against the war was hauled before the courts and sentenced as a traitor. In many countries the workers were deprived of all freedom of movement, being forbidden to transfer from one enterprise to another. "Free" wage workers were reduced to serfdom; they were doomed to perish on the battlefields, not on behalf of their own cause but on behalf of that of their enemies. They were doomed to work themselves to death, not for their own sake or for that of their comrades or their children, but for the sake of their oppressors.

From the ABC of Communism
by
Bukharin and Preobrashensky

Part I

Nature, Function and Policy of the
Revolutionary Party of the Working - Class

The question concerning the policy of the party is of essential importance and is made clear in connection with the history of conflicting tendencies and aims that occurred in the second and third International. It is not to be thought that such a question is of an additional and derived nature, in the sense that groups complying with the doctrine and platform, may maintain and apply methods different in the action, even with regards to casual events, without contradicting such bases. To discuss problems concerning the nature and action of the party means to pass from the ground of critical interpretation of social events, into that of the influence which an actively working force may exert upon such events. This transition represents the most important and delicate point of the whole Marxist system and was inserted in Marx' early sayings: "Philosophers have done nothing but interpret the world till now, the matter is of changing it at last," and "from the weapon of the critique, to the critique of weapons". Such a change, from mere knowledge into working action, shall be intended, according to the method of dialectical materialism, in a way quite different from that of the followers of traditional ideologies. Many a time it was suitable to the opponents of Communism to turn to their account theoretic Marxist knowledge, in order to damage and revoke its consequences for action and struggle, or else, on the other hand to feign to adhere to the practice of the proletarian party, but to confute and reject its critical bases of principle. In all these cases the deviation was the reflection of anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary influences, and it displayed itself in the crisis which we indicate for sake of briefness, with the name of opportunism. Principles and doctrines do not exist by themselves as a foundation arisen and laid before the action; the latter as well as the former are engendered in a parallel process. It is the concurrent material interests which practically drive social groups into struggle and it is from the action arisen from such material interests that originates the theory which becomes the peculiar patrimony of the party. Altering the ratio of interests, the incentives to the action and the practical aims of the latter, the whole doctrine of the party is changed and deformed. To think that the latter may become sacred and untouchable, on account of its codification in a programmatic text, and of a strict organizative and disciplinary framework of the organism of the party, and therefore the varied and numerous aims and maneuvers in the tactical action can be allowed, means not to understand in a Marxist manner, what is the exact problem to be solved in order to get to the choice of methods of action. We return to the evaluation of determinism. Do social events develop by uncontrollable forces, giving rise to different ideologies, theories and opinions of men or may they be modified by a more or less conscious human will? The question is faced by the proper method of the proletarian party, by removing the traditional ideological bases at the root always referring to the single individual, feigning to solve the question on behalf of the individual and then of deducing its solution on behalf of the social whole. Traditionally, the collectivity was the other metaphysical abstraction which is the society of mankind. While, from the Marxist view point it is a concretely, definite group of individuals who in a given circumstance have the same interests owing to their social relationships, owing to their place in the production and economy; groups of individuals which are just styled classes. Being numerous, the social classes which human history contains, there cannot be solved in a same generic way the problem concerning their skill of understanding exactly the process wherein they live, and

of exerting a certain influence upon it. Every historical class has had its own party, system of opinions and propaganda. Everyone has pretended with equal insistence to interpret exactly the sense of events and to be able to direct them towards a more or less vaguely conceived aim. Marxism affords the criticism and evidence of all these problems, proving that the varied ideological generalizations were the reflection of the conditions and interests of the struggling classes upon opinions. In this continuous alternation, of which the material interests are the causes, the groups of men organized in parties and class organisms of the State are the protagonists, the political and philosophical schools are the exterior traits. Being opportune, the social conditions of its formation, the modern proletarian class will present itself with new and superior capacities, both as for possession of a real method of interpreting the whole historical movement, and as for concrete efficacy of its action of social and political struggle in influencing the general course of this movement. This other main concept was expressed by the Marxists with the sayings not less known and classical: "The Socialist revolution represents the transition from the world of necessity into that of freedom". The matter is not to put the question in the commonplace traditional terms, whether man is free in his will or determined by the environment, whether a class and its party have consciousness of their historical mission, whether it is from this theoretic consciousness that it derives the power to attain the purpose of a general improvement and whether they are driven into struggle, success or unsuccessfully by superior or unknown forces. First of all, we must ask ourselves of what classes and parties is the problem, what are their relation in the field of the forces of production and powers of the State, what is the historic phase gone through and the one left to go through, according to the results of the critical analysis. According to the doctrine of religious schools, the factor of events is outside of man in the creating divinity that has established everything and even thought of granting man a certain freedom for which he is to answer in a future life. It is well known that such a posing of the problem of will and determinism is rejected by the Marxist analysis. But also the solution of the bourgeois philosophy with its claims of enlightening criticism and its illusion to have removed every arbitrary and revealed presupposition, stands likewise deceptive, for the problem of action is always reduced to a proportion of subject and object and the starting-point, in the ancient and recent versions of the various idealistic systems, is found in the individual subject, in the Ego. It exists only in the working of his thoughts and is next turned into the intervention of this ego on nature and society. Hence arises the political and juridical life of the bourgeois system for which man is free, and as a citizen, is entitled to manage public affairs and therefore his own interests according to the opinion arisen in his mind. The Marxist interpretation of history and human action, if it has therefore rejected the intervention of every transcendent influence and revealed word, has upset the bourgeois scheme of freedom and will of the individual, proving how it is his needs and interests that originate his movement, and action and how his opinions and beliefs and what is called consciousness arises only as a result of the most complicated influences. Truly, the problem is well planned and its solution can be faced when, from the metaphysical concept of consciousness and will of the ego, we get into the real and scientific one of the theoretic knowledge of the historic and political action of the class party. This solution is of first importance for the movement and party of the modern proletariat.

To be continued

Translated by L. Massari from "Proletto,"
Monthly magazine of the
Internationalist Communist Party of
Italy